Archives of Business Research – Vol.5, No.12
Publication Date: Dec. 25, 2017
DOI: 10.14738/abr.512.4054.
Awino, Z. B., Ayuya, A. M., Machuki, V. N., & Wainaina, G. (2017). Strategic Choice and Performance: An Overview Of Institutions Of Higher Learning. Archives of Business Research, 5(12), 378-390.

SOCIETY FOR SCIENCE AND EDUCATION

Strategic Choice and Performance: An Overview Of Institutions Of Higher Learning

Zachary B. Awino
Associate Professor, School of Business, University of Nairobi.

Angeline Mukokho Ayuya
Doctoral Student, School of Business, University of Nairobi.

Vincent N. Machuki
Senior Lecturer, School of Business, University of Nairobi.

Gituro Wainaina
Associate Professor, School of Business, University of Nairobi.

ABSTRACT

Organizational performance is critical for both empirical and conceptual research in strategy. Strategic choice serves as a major connection between the organization and the environment in which it operates and involves decisions on the mix of business portfolio. Scholars attribute the strategic choices which determine organizational performance to the type of strategies they choose, yet there is no agreement on the extent to which these strategic choices influence performance. This paper sought to contribute to knowledge by assessing the extent to which strategic choice influences organizational performance. The objective of this paper was to establish the influence of strategic choice on organizational performance. The research used a cross sectional survey. This study used a sample of fifty two (52) private and public accredited universities. Both primary and secondary data was collected using semi structured questionnaires. An analysis was done using correlation and regression analysis to test the hypotheses. The objective confirmed significant results on non-financial performance. The findings of this research are consistent with most of the previous studies. This study therefore extends the knowledge frontiers in strategic management through the finding that strategic choice influences organizational performance. The findings provide a diversity of implications on theory, policy and practice. Policy makers will utilize the findings from this study as a guide in the policy formulation and implementation of strategic choices aimed at the success of the institutions of higher learning.

Key words: Strategic Choice, Organizational Performance, Empirical Investigation, Institutions of Higher Learning

INTRODUCTION

Strategic choice is central to strategy making. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2009) define strategic choice as a process that takes into consideration what the stakeholders expect, identifying options available, then evaluating and selecting the best strategic options for implementation. The Strategic choice indicates the various ways and directions in which a strategy may be implemented (Johnson et al., 2009). The managers who make strategic decisionsare expected to be involved in various organizational activities that require strategic thinking.They are expected tobe knowledgeable about their organization and the operational environment. They are also required to have information about the competitors' operation, and the prevailing regulatory systems (Bukszar& Connolly, 1988).According to Johnson et al (2009), strategic management involvesassessingthe current strategic position of an organization in order to choose and manage the best strategies for the organization.Strategic choiceprovides a connection between an organization and the environment in which it operates. The focus is on how the top managers are able to gain knowledge and understanding of how to manage the organization's environment and find ways of how these organizations can respond to the prevailing environmental conditions(Machuki, 2011;Namada, 2013). According to Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) and Dutton and Duncan (1987), strategic choice involves decisions on the mix and emphases of business portfolio which includes strategic alliances, diversification and internal restructuring.

The type of strategic choice and how effective it is depends on how the top managers interpret the environmental issues and adopt the right choices Dutton and Duncan, (1987). Tushman and Romanelli (1985) argue that it is how the top managers perceive the changes in the environment that determines the choice of viable strategies. The top management teams therefore allow for creativity and innovativeness in the choice of the strategies. Due to globalization and advancements in technology, organizational environments go through catastrophic changes and organizations have to go through these upheavals which usually surpass their capacities to adapt (Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch & Topolynyscky, 2002).The turbulence in the environment is so fast that in the face of lack of or obsolete market information, viable strategic windows open and shut very fast and the cost of mistakes may lead to an organization’s exit from the market (Meyer et al, 2002)..

If organizations have to remain viable and competitive, the top managers must make strategic choices which match with the turbulent environment. Ansoff and Sullivan (1993) argue that these strategic choices should be complimented by the aggressiveness of these choices. This argument is supported by Machuki and Aosa (2011) in the thinking that organizational performance depends on how an organization aligns with the changes in the environment. This study seeks to find out how an integration of the Strategic choice of internal restructuring, diversification and strategic alliances conceptualized in this study in accredited universities in Kenya can improve their performance.

Organizational performance relates to the efficiency and effectiveness of the firm in converting inputs into outputs (McCann, 2004). Efficiency can be described as the cost per unit in relation to the goods and services produced and the resources that have been utilized in the production process.Anorganization’s performance is measured by the level of expected customer-related results which can be measured by customer satisfaction level, their loyalty, frequency of purchase and repurchase of an organization’s products (Kaplan &Norton, 1996).In the context of accredited universities in Kenya, organizational performance is a measure of capabilities in research and innovation, number of quality degree programmes offered, growth in number of students who have graduated, growth and expansion of schools and faculties.Different methods are used to measure organizational performance as it remains a complex multidimensional phenomenon in strategic management (Balta, 2008).

Sabina (2009) argues that it is imperative to measure organizational performance so that managers and researchers can evaluate the position of the organization against its rivals. It has however, been realized that measurement of organizational performance has posed a major challenge to both researchers and practitioners. According to Sink and Turtle (1989) model, organization performance system is categorized in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, quality of products, productivity, quality of work life, innovation and profitability.Many studies of organizational performance have used performance as the dependent variable but with different variables which indicate the level of variations in performance. (Muchemi, 2013; Namada, 2013).Schendeland Hatten (1972) positthat foran organization to succeed the top managers must be able tocombine many factors. According to Lenz, (1980) empirical studies address particular aspects of this broad problem of managing multiple dependencies. Financial measures of performance include financial ratios, cash flow or liquidity measures, activity ratios among others. Financial ratios may be calculated in different ways, using different figures and measures include profitability ratios (gross profit, net profit, Return on Investment (ROI), Earnings Per Share (EPS), growth in sales, market valuation, total assets and liquidity ratios among others.

Due to the inefficiencies of the financial measures, Kaplan and Norton (1996) introduced the balanced score card (BSC) as a tool to measure organizational performance. It measures performance using four perspectives: financial perspective, customer perspective, learning and growth and internal business processes. Over the years, organizations are using sustainable balanced score cardwhich includes corporate social responsibility and environmental perspectives (Hubbard, 2009). Organizations should endeavour to make use of both financial and non-financial indicators to measure their organizational performance (Velcu, 2009). The debate on measurement of organizational performance still continues. Different organizations use different ways of measuring organizational performance which are either qualitative or quantitative (Krager& Parnell, 1996). Irungu (2007) in his study used financial measures only, while Orucho (2014) used both financial and non-financial measures. It has been argued (Kaplan & Norton, 2001) that financial indicators do not take into consideration non-financial measures such as efficiency, customer perspective, new business processes and do not focus on the future. As Kennerly and Neely (2003) pointed out, many organizations cannot cope with the fast changing performance measurement system. Thus, poor performance is attributed to inadequate performance measurements and inappropriate strategic choice (Oyewobi, Windapo&Rotimi, 2002).

Some researchers further argue that both financial and non-financial measures should be used due to failure of financial measures in explaining what really contributes to the achievement of performance in organizations (Cooper &Aouad, 2001; Bourne, Mills, Wilcox, Neely &Platts, 2000).This study conceptualized organizational performance as an independent variable and adopted the Sustainable Balanced Score Card framework as a performance measurement tool which incorporates financialperformancemeasurementsdin terms of surplus/deficit, research grants and endowment funds. Thenon-financial organizational performance has been operationalized using customer perspective, new business processes, learning and growth both ofwhich are relevant to accredited universities in Kenya.

Accredited world universities and colleges are a key area of interest in strategic management as they play a key role in the economy (Gichaga & Wainaina, 2005; UNESCO, 2014). Studies in higher education in Asia (Malaysia and Thailand) Chapman (2015) and Ozsoy (2011) study of 179 universities across Europe, Latin America and Sub-saharan Africa, posit that higher education through universities and colleges are centres of economic development in the area of research, innovation and production of highly skilled manpower.These studies established that technology and globalization affect the accredited world universities and colleges in the various regions.Theworldaccrediteduniversities are resource dependent on fees, income generating units and other stakeholders. They operate in uncertain fluctuating environments and are affiliated to institutions that ensure quality assurance as they develop expansion strategies within and across continents. American universities are guided on various policies on research and quality education under the Association of American Universities (AAU). Other universities are affiliated to the Association of Commonwealthuniversities. Research has shown that universities in the developing countries depend on donor funding for research activities and scholars are sponsored by various organizations such as Ford Foundation and Rockefeller Foundation.

There has been a growing emphasis on higher education in Kenya over the decades. This is in line with the demands of both economic and social developmental goals (Sifuna, 1998). The increase of the number of students leaving high school and seeking higher education has led to the congestion in the institutions of higher learning in Kenya, with poor working conditions and inadequate and poor facilities. The ever increasing demand for higher education in Kenya has therefore led to the increase in the number of both private and public universities over the decades.The change from the 7-4-2-3 cycle to the present 8-4-4 system of education in Kenya has led to the double intake by universities and his resulted in more public and private universities. The public universities rely on tuition fees and diminishing funding from the government while the private universities depend on tuition fees and private investors. The expansion of private universities is attributed to the failure of the public universities to meet the high demand for higher education (Ginies&Marzuelle, 2010).

Eshiwani (1999) in his study on higher education institutions of learning pointed out that apart from provision of education and training in a framework of teaching and research in professional disciplines (Law, Medicine, Engineering and Accounting among others) they provide human resource development. In addition, these institutions of higher learning are expected to function as centres of research operating in a wide range of disciplines. They are also expected to play their role in regional development and also maintain international collaborations. Their role in fostering social, intellectual and development is paramount.The emerging global knowledge society which is information driven economies and the expansion in the global higher education markets has increased the search for a myriad of factors to be addressed. There are complexities brought about by the increase in number of institutional of higher learning and increased student enrolments together with the resultant competition. The expectations of the society and the role in economic development given the inadequate resources both human and capital calls for this study which has integrated the choice of strategies, linked with organizational learning and top managers with different characteristics that influence performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Strategic management scholars and practitioners agree that the ability of organizations to learn faster than its competitors is theultimatesource of competitive advantage. Hutzschenreuter and Israel (2009) contend that strategic actions determinecompetitive strategy by making variations in the way organizational routines are carried out, and as a result, influences the strategic choices that will be made in future. Strategic choices based on innovation, product positioning, and chain relationship development have positive effects on performance, but this depends on the type of distinctive resources and capabilities that are used. Innovation is considered a very important capability within an organization as it improves performance (Teece, 2007; Ombaka, 2014). This underscores the importance of strategic choices in developing organizational culture through path dependence.

According to Davies and Walters (2004), strategic choice is used to secure revenues from customers and this is a key requirement in resource dependence. Strategic choice can also be used by organizations to seek a dynamic strategic link in the strategies they use to generate cashflows that are the key to the mitigation of resource dependence (Child, 1972). The challenge of financing and mobilizing resources has a negative effect on organizational performance. Carraresi, Mamaqi, Albisu, and Banterle(2011) did a study on relationship between SC and performance of Italian food SMEs and posits that SC has a positive influence on performance.The SC perspective (Child, 1972) focuses on the decisions the organizational top managers make in adapting to an environment which explains the organizational outcomes. Its proponents argue that many purposeful actions take place within organizations and that organizational top managers have substantial leeway in shaping their own fates. This implies that the focus is on individuals and groups within organizations which explains organizational processes. This focus on behavior therefore assumes that organizational top managers have the discretion of acting according to their own free will (Hambrick, 1984; Hambrick, 2007; Namada, 2013).

Strategic choiceas a contemporary contribution to organizational performance derives from its potential to integrate some of the different perspectives in organizational studies (Child, 1997). Organizational outcomes such as learning, strategies (diversification, strategic alliances and internal restructuring) and their effectiveness in organizations are considered as reflections of the values and cognitive bases of the powerful actors in the organizations (Hambrick&Mason, 1984;Namada, 2013). The most dynamic higher education institutions in the market place are those that are techno-intensive and they depend on the capacity to generate, adapt and utilize knowledge as the foundation. However, organizations have a challenge of production, dissemination and utilization of knowledge and technological innovations which affect performance (Kinyanjui, 2007).

METHODS

This study used a descriptive cross-sectional survey since the purpose of the study was to establish the relationship between and amongst the study variables and performance oftheaccredited universities in Kenya. The cross-sectional approach provides credence of results with conclusions on data at a given point in time.The unit of analysis was accredited universities in Kenya. The Commission for University Education had listed 70 accredited universities (CUE, 2015) which included public and private universities with their constituent colleges and institutions with letters of interim authority. The population of the study was, however, 52 accredited universities in Kenya listed by the Commission of University Educationwhichwere autonomous and had been in operation for at least five years – an adequate period for strategic plans. At the time of the study, out of the 52 accredited universities, 30were public universities while 22 were private universities.

The study targeted only one respondent from each accredited university in Kenya for purposes of objectivity and consistency. This method has been used successfully in other studies (Machuki&Aosa, 2011; Orucho, 2014). Primary data wastherefore collected by administering questionnaires to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration and Finance) or their equivalent (Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Research, Registrar, Administration assisted by the Finance officer/Director) in each accredited university. This is because these are the top management staff in the institutions that are endowed with the responsibility of running the institutions by setting and implementing strategies and are also in a position to provide useful information for this study.

Secondary data was obtained from existing sources at the accredited universities websites, financial reports and accounts for the period of this study (2009/2010, 2010/2011, 2011/2012. 2012/2013 and 2013/2014, financial statements, annual reports, World universities webometrics rankings, university calendars, strategic plans(2008-2013) and other existing records from (CUE) that were relevant to performance of accredited universities in Kenya. Performance contracting records between 2009 and 2014 from Ministry of Planning and Devolutions were also using records to this study since they are relevant and important as they provide an understanding of the operations and performance of the accredited universities in Kenya.According to Zikmund (2003), secondary data can be gathered using various sources including annual reports, books and periodicals, and government sources.

RESULTS

The paper sought to establish the independent influence of strategic choice on performance of accredited universities in Kenya. Strategic choice was operationalized as; internal restructuring, diversification and strategic alliances. Internal restructuring indicators are; automation of processes, decentralization of colleges, creation of income generating units, and establishment of schools. The indicators for diversification are entry in new markets, new degree programmes and acquisition of new constituent colleges. The indicators of strategic alliances are collaboration with research institutes, exchange programmes and public private partnerships. Non-financial indicator comprise of customer perspective, learning and growth and new business processes. The hypothesis was tested using simple linear regression analysis. The coefficient of determination R^2 together with standardized beta was used to find out the significance of the regression results.

The objective of this paper was to establish the influence of strategic choice on performance of accredited universities in Kenya and this was stated as:
H_{01}: Strategic choice has no significant influence on performance of accredited universities in Kenya.

The results of the tests of hypothesis are as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Strategic Choice and Non-Financial Performance

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.774[a]	.599	.589	1.89446	2.136

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	214.212	1	214.212	59.686	.000[b]
	Residual	143.559	40	3.589		
	Total	357.770	41			

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	7.954	1.580		5.034	.000
	Strategic choice	.589	.076	.774	7.726	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), strategic choice

The results in Table 1 show that R^2 is .599 which means 59.9 percent of variation in non-financial performance was explained by strategic choice. The remaining 40.1 percent is explained by other factors not considered in the study. The beta coefficient of .774 shows that 1 percent change in strategic choice leads to .774 change in non-financial performance of accredited universities in Kenya. The model had a p-value significance of .000 which revealed a statistically significant model. This shows that strategic choice has a significant influence on non-financial performance of accredited universities in Kenya.

Strategic choice shows the various options of strategies employed by organizations to improve performance. These strategies connect the organization to the environment (Johnson et. al., 2009). Percentage growth was a component of non-financial performance in this study.

H_{o1b}: There is no relationship between strategic choice and percentage growth

The paper sought to establish the relationship between strategic choice and percentage growth. The results of this relationship are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Relationship between Strategic Choice and Percentage Growth

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.033[a]	.001	-.025	170.78131	2.120

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1207.578	1	1207.578	.041	.840[b]
	Residual	1137483.915	39	29166.254		
	Total	1138691.493	40			

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	34.895	145.044		.241	.811
	Strategic Choice	1.418	6.970	.033	.203	.840

a. Dependent Variable: percentage growth
b. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Choice

The results in Table 2 show that R^2 is .001 which means 0.1 percent variation in Strategic choice was explained by percentage growth. The remaining 99.99 percent is explained by other factors not considered in the study. The model had a p-value significance of .840 which revealed a no statistically significant model. This shows that SC has no significant influence on percentage growth in the accredited universities in Kenya.

Previous research (Namada, 2013) focused on non-financial measures of organizational performance only. Chavravarthy (1986) in his study used financial measures only and found that profitability did not distinguish the differences in strategic performance of organizations. This study tested the following hypothesis.

H_{o1c}: There is no relationship between strategic choice and financial performance

The research sought to establish the relationship between strategic choice and financial performance of accredited universities in Kenya. Table 3 below shows the results.

Table 3: Relationship between Strategic Choice and Financial Performance

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.305[a]	.093	.068	503081766.16174

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	935256586022863490.000	1	935256586022863490.000	3.695	.063[b]
	Residual	9111285483999018000.000	36	253091263444417152.000		
	Total	10046542070021882000.000	37			

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-515233784.395	452778912.900		-1.138	.263
	Strategic Choice	41602368.551	21641693.716	.305	1.922	.063

a. Dependent Variable: financial performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Choice

The results in Table 3 illustrate that R^2 is .093 which means 9.3 percent variation in financial performance was explained by strategic choice. The remaining 90.7 percent is explained by other factors not considered in the study. The model had a p-value significance of .063 which is greater than 0.05 the model was not statistically significant. This shows that strategic choice has no significant influence on financial performance of accredited universities in Kenya.

Research is a core function of the accredited universities in Kenya. The accredited universities receive and manage research and endowment funds and therefore the performance of these universities can be measured based on the amount of the funds received for research purposes. This study therefore sought to test the relationship between strategic choice and research and endowment funds. The results of the findings are shown in Table 4.

H_{o1d}: There is no relationship between strategic choice and research and endowment funds

The results of the findings are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4:Relationship between Strategic Choice and Research and Endowment Funds

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.320[a]	.102	.077	1197255520.68652

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	5884001805957096400.000	1	5884001805957096400.000	4.105	.050[b]
	Residual	51603148145316910000.000	36	1433420781814358780.000		
	Total	57487149951274010000.000	37			

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-1261874939.212	1022785387.104		-1.234	.225
	Strategic Choice	99585134.852	49152426.837	.320	2.026	.050

a. Dependent Variable: research funds
a. Predictors: (Constant), Strategic Choice

The results in Table 4 showR^2 of .102 which means 10.2 percent variation in strategic choice was explained by research and endowment funds. The remaining 89.8 percent is explained by other factors not considered in the study. The model had a p-value significance of 0.05 which revealed a statistically significant model. This shows that research and endowment funds have a significant influence on strategic choice in accredited universities in Kenya.

This paper also sought to find out the strength of the relationship between internal restructuring and Performance of Accredited Universities in Kenya. The results are shown n Table 5 below.

Hypothesis $H_{01}e$: There is no relationship between internal restructuring and performance of accredited universities in Kenya

Table 5: Influence of Internal Restructuring on Organizational Performance

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.770[a]	.592	.582	1.88650

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	211.859	1	211.859	59.529	.000[b]
	Residual	145.914	41	3.559		
	Total	357.773	42			

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	8.589	1.500		5.725	.000
	SC_internal restructuring	.536	.070	.770	7.716	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Non-financial performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), SC internal restructuring

The results in Table 5 shows an R^2 of .592 which means 59.2 percent of the variation in organizational performance was explained by internal restructuring. The remaining 40.8 percent is explained by other factors not considered in the study. The model had a p-value of .000 which revealed a statistically significant model. This means that internal restructuring has a significant influence on non-financial performance.

The paper sought to test the strength of the relationship between diversification and performance of accredited universities in Kenya and the results are shown in Table6 below.

$H_{01f;}$ There is no relationship between diversification and performance of accredited universities in Kenya

Table 6:Influence of Diversification on Organizational Performance

Model Summary						
Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1		.666[a]	.444	.430	2.20265	
ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	158.855	1	158.855	32.742	.000[b]
	Residual	198.918	41	4.852		
	Total	357.773	42			
Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.432	1.697		6.147	.000
	SCdiverse	.502	.088	.666	5.722	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Non-financial performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), SC diversity

The results in Table 6 show R^2 of .444 which implies that 44.4 percent variation in performance was explained by diversification. The remaining 55.6 percent is explained by other factors not considered in this study. The model had a p-value of .000 which revealed a statistically significant model. This implies that diversification has a significant influence on non-financial performance.

Strategic alliances was one of the indicators of SC and this study therefore sought to find out the magnitude of the strength of relationship of strategic alliances on performance of accredited universities in Kenya.

H_{o1g}: There is no relationship between strategic alliances and performance of accredited universities in Kenya.

Table 7: Influence of Strategic Alliances on Organizational Performance

Model Summary						
Model		R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	
1		.698[a]	.488	.475	2.14064	
ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	174.477	1	174.477	38.076	.000[b]
	Residual	183.293	40	4.582		
	Total	357.770	41			
Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	10.300	1.598		6.445	.000
	SC alliances	.465	.075	.698	6.171	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Non-financial performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), SCalliances

The results in Table 7 show R^2 of .488 which means 48.8 percent variation in organizational performance was explained by strategic alliances. The remaining 51.2 percent is explained by other factors not considered in this study. The model had a p-value of .000 which revealed a statistically significant model. This means that strategic alliances had a significant influence on non-financial performance.

CONCLUSION

The objective of this paper sought to establish the influence of strategic choice on performance of accredited universities in Kenya. A corresponding hypothesis Ho_1 was stated. The research findings established that strategic choice was not statistically significant on some of the sustainable balanced score card measures of performance. The results of the multivariate regression analysis which were carried out to determine the influence of strategic choice on non-financialperformance of accredited universities in Kenya revealed that strategic choice had positive relationships with non-financialperformance of accredited universities in Kenya, while there was no relationship between strategic choice and financial performance of accredited universities in Kenya.

When each of the three SC indicators were regressed with performance of accredited universities in Kenya, internal restructuring was found to be the most significant predictor of performance of accredited universities in Kenya with p-value <0.05, followed by strategic alliances with a p-value <0.05 and diversification with a p-value < 0.05. All the three predictors of SC were found to be statistically significant with p-values <0.05. The regression model relating each strategic choice and performance of accredited universities in Kenya was also established. All of them had a positive correlation withperformance of accredited universities in Kenya. These results were in consistent with both theory and practice, with internal restructuring as the most consistent and stable indicator ofperformance of accredited universities in Kenya.

In summary, the findings show that there exists high positive correlation between strategic choices and performance of accredited universities in Kenya. The relationship shows that these strategic choices explain 59.9 percent of the variation in performance of accredited universities in Kenya. Therefore, the null hypothesis 1 was rejected since there is a significant relationship between Strategic choice and performance of accredited universities in Kenya. These results are consistent with the Industrial Economics theory in relation with strategic choice and organizational performance. This theory emphasizes the organization's alignment to the environment through strategic choice that lead to superior organizational performance (Bain, 1951, Mason, 1939; Porter, 1981).

References

Ansoff, H.I. (1957). Strategies for diversification. *Harvard Business Review.*35, (5), 113-124.

Ansoff, H. I., & Sullivan, P.A. (1993). Optimizing profitability in turbulent environments: A formula for strategic success. *Long Range Planning Review,* 26, 11-23.

Bain, J. S. (1956). *Barriers to new competition*. Cambridge, Mass. Harvard University Press.

Balta, M.E. (2008). The impact of business environment and boards of directors on strategic decision-making: A case study of Greek listed companies*. Unpublished PhD Thesis*, Bruneri Business School.

Bourne, M., Mills, J., Wilcox, M., Neely, A., &Platts, K. (2000). Designing, implementing and updating performance measurement systems. *International Journal of Operations Management,* 20(7), 754-771.

Bukszar, E., &Connolly, T. (1988). Hindsight bias and strategic choice: Some problems in learning from experience. *Academy of Management Journal,* 31, 628-641.

Carraresi, L., Mamaqi, X., Albisu, L. M., &Banterle, A. (2011). *The relationship between strategic choices and performance in Italianfood SMEs: A resource-based approach*. McGrawHill: New Delhi.

Chakravarthy, B.S. (1986). Measuring strategic performance. *Strategic Management Journal,* 7(5), 437-458.

Chapman, D. W (2015). *Higher education in Asia: Expanding out: Expanding up*. UNESCO Institute of Statistics, Montreal, Canada.

Child, J. (1972). Organizational structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice. *Sociology,*6, 1-22.

Child, J. (1997). Strategic choice in the analysis of action, structure, organizations and environment: Retrospect and prospect. *Organization Studies,*18(1), 43-76.

Commission for University Education (2013).

Cooper, M.K., &Aouad, G. (2001). Performance management in construction: A conceptual framework. *Construction Management in Economics,* 19(1), 85-95.

Davies, L., &Walters, I. (2003). Strategic choice and the nature of the Chinese family business: An exploratory study of the Hong Kong watch industry. *OrganisationalStudies*, 24(2), 1405-1435.

Dutton, J.E.,& Duncan, R.B. (1987).The creation of momentum for change through the process of strategic issue diagnosis.*Strategic Management Journal,* 8, 279-296.

Dutton, J. E.,& Duncan, R.B. (1987).Strategic issue diagnosis and its relationship to organizational change.*Strategic Management Journal,* 4, 307-323.

Eshiwani, G.S. (1999). *Education in Kenya since independence.* East African Educational Publishers.

Ginies, P.,&Mazurelle, K. J. (2010).Managing university-industry relations: A study of institutional practices from 12 different countries. *Journal of Higher Education,* 5, 7-10.

Gichaga, F.J., &Wainaina, G. (2005). A study on university-industry linkage in Kenya.*A report submitted to the Commission for Higher Education*.

Hambrick, D.C. (2007). Upper echelons theory: An update*. Academy of Management Review,* 32(2), 334-43.

Hambrick, D. C.,& Mason,P. A. (1984).Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers.*Academy of Management Review*, 9, 193-206.

Hubbard, G. (2009). Measuring organizational performance: Beyond the triple bottom-line. *Business Strategy and Environment,* 19, 177-191.

Hutzschenreuter, T., &Israel, S. (2009).A review of empirical research on dynamic competitivestrategy.*International Journal of Management Reviews,*11(4), 421–61.

Irungu, M.S. (2007). Effect of top management teams on performance of publicly quoted companies in Kenya.*Unpublished PhD thesis*, University of Nairobi.

Johnson, G., Scholes, K.,& Whittington, R. (2009).*Exploring corporate strategy*.(7thed.) Dorling, India.

Kaplan, R.S. (2001). Transforming balanced score card from performance measurement: Part 1. *Accounting Horizons,* 87-104.

Kaplan, R. S.,& Norton, D.P. (1996).*The balanced scorecard: Translating strategy into action,* Boston: HBS Press.

Kennerly, M.,& Neely, A. (2003).Measuring performance in a changing business environment.*Journal of Operations and Production Management,* 2, 213-229.

Kinyanjui, K. (2007). The transformation of higher education in Kenya: challenges and opportunities. *Paper presented at the 'mijadala on social policy, governance and development in Kenya' Nairobi*.

Krager, J.,& Parnell, J.A. (1996). Strategic planning emphasis and planning satisfaction in small firms: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Business Strategies,* 120, 131-139.

Lenz, R. T. (1980). Environment, strategy, organization structure and performance: patterns in one industry. *StrategicManagement Journal*, 1,209-226.

McCann, J. (2004). The changing definition of organizational effectiveness. *Human Resource Planning,* 1(27), 17-30.

Machuki, V.N. (2011). External environment, strategy co-alignment, firm level institutions and performance of publicly quoted companies in Kenya. *Unpublished PhD thesis*, University of Nairobi.

Machuki, V.N.,&Aosa, E. (2011).The influence of external environment on the performance of publicly quoted companies in Kenya.*Business Administration and Management Journal,* 1(7), 205-218.

Meyer, J. P., Stanley, D.J., Herscovitch, L.,&Topolynyscky (2002). Affective, continuous and normative commitment to the organization: A meta-analysis of antecedent, correlates and consequences. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour,* 61, 20-62.

Muchemi, A.W. (2013). Top management team diversity and performance of commercial banks in Kenya. *Unpublished PhD thesis*, University of Nairobi.

Namada, J.M. (2013). Strategic planning systems, organizational learning and performance of firms in export processing zones in Kenya. *Unpublished PhD thesis*, University of Nairobi.

Ombaka, B. E. (2014). Resources, external environment, innovation and performance of insurance companies in Kenya.*Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nairobi.*

Orucho, M.N. (2014). Higher education-economic sector linkage strategies, competitive forces and performance of the public and private universities incorporated in Kenya. *Unpublished PhD thesis,* University of Nairobi.

Oyewobi, L.O., Windapo, A.O.,&Rotimi, J.O.B. (2002).The effects of business environment on corporate strategies and performance of construction organizations.*Association of Researchers in Construction Management,* 691-701.

Ozsoy, C. (2011). The contribution of higher learning to economic development. *University Journal*, 14, 5-9.

Pfeffer, J.,&Salancik, G.R. (1978). The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective. Harper and Row, New York.

Porter, M. E. (1981). The contributions of industrial organization to strategic management. *The Academy of Management Review,* 609-620.

Sabina, N. (2009). Top management team diversity: A review of theories and methodologies. *International Journal of Management Review,* 22, 1468-1470.

Schendel, D., &Hatten, K. J. (1972). Business Policy or Strategic Management: A Broader View foran Emerging Discipline.*Academy of Management Proceedings*, 99 –102.

Sifuna, D.N. (1998). The governance of Kenyan public universities. *Research in Post-secondary Education Review,* 3, 2-8.

Sink, S.,& Turtle, T. (1989). Planning and measurement in your organization of the future. Industrial Engineering and Management Press, Norcross G.A.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G.,&Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal,* 18(7), 509–33.

Tushman, M.,&Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: A metamorphosis model of convergence and re-orientation. *Research in Organizational Behaviour,* 7, 171-222.

UNESCO (2014). *Rankings and accountability in higher education: Uses and advances* (UNESCO publishing 7, Place de Fontonoy, 75352 07 SP, France.

Velcu, N. (2009). Exploring the effects of ERP systems on organizational performance: Evidence from Finnish companies. *The Journal of Industrial Management and Data Systems,* 9, 1316-1334.